

HST Observations of the Wolf-Rayet Nebula NGC 6888

Brian D. Moore, J. Jeff Hester, and Paul A. Scowen

*Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Arizona State University, Box 871504, Tempe, AZ 85287-1504*

ABSTRACT

We present *Hubble Space Telescope* WFPC2 images of a portion of the bright northeast rim of NGC 6888, the nebular shell physically associated with the Wolf-Rayet star HD 192163. The exposures are taken in the light of $H\alpha$ $\lambda 6563$, $[O\ III]$ $\lambda 5007$, and $[S\ II]$ $\lambda\lambda 6717, 6731$. The images are used to constrain models of the ionization structure of nebular features. From these models we infer physical conditions within features, and estimate elemental abundances within the nebula. The results of our analysis, together with the degree of small scale inhomogeneity apparent in the images, call into question the assumptions underlying traditional methodologies for interpretation of nebular spectroscopy.

The thermal pressure of photoionized clumps is higher than the inferred internal pressure of the shocked stellar wind, implying that the current physical conditions have changed significantly over less than a few thousand years. These results are discussed within the context of published three-wind evolutionary scenarios for the formation of the nebula. We also discuss the nature of a back-illuminated radiative shock driven into the cavity surrounding NGC 6888.

Subject headings: H II regions – ISM: individual (NGC 6888) – ISM: kinematics and dynamics – stars: individual (HD 192163) – stars: mass loss

1. Introduction

Wolf-Rayet (WR) stars are thought to be the late stage of the evolution of stars more massive than $\sim 30 M_{\odot}$. WR stars are characterized as possessing significant stellar winds, large in both mass-loss rate and terminal velocity. Observations of 62 Galactic WR stars in the northern sky show that about half are associated with nebular emission (Miller and Chu 1993), some of which are ring nebulae. Johnson and Hogg (1965) were the first to propose that these ring nebulae were formed by stellar wind interaction with the local interstellar medium. Attempts have been made to analytically explain the formation and structure of such nebulae (Weaver et al. 1977; Van Buren 1986).

One of the most prominent and best studied examples of this class of object is NGC 6888. NGC 6888 is associated with WR 136 (HD 192163), considered to be a member of the Cygnus OB1 association. Its large angular size ($18' \times 12'$) has made it an attractive object for investigation at a variety

of wavelengths. For a distance of 1450 pc (Wendker et al. 1975) the nebula has a physical size of $7.6\text{ pc} \times 5.0\text{ pc}$. One of the first detailed studies of NGC 6888 was that of Lozhinskaya (1970) who, assuming that the nebula is prolate ellipsoid, stated that the nebula is tilted $\sim 30^\circ$ out of the sky. Later studies (Parker 1978; Kwitter 1981) used emission-line ratios to show that the nebula is overabundant in nitrogen and helium and underabundant in oxygen. Explanations for this enrichment include the transport of processed material from the stellar interior to the outer atmosphere prior to the onset of the RSG phase (Esteban and Vilchez 1992), and the mixing of interstellar and wind material (Kwitter 1981). The high level of nitrogen is consistent with the classification of WR 136 as a WN6 star. An $[O\ III]$ skin external to the $H\alpha$ nebulosity has previously been observed (Dufour 1989; Mitra 1990), suggesting that the stellar wind and the expanding shell are interacting with the bubble outside the RSG shell.

There have been a number of hydrodynamical

simulations of the formation of Wolf-Rayet shells like NGC 6888. The most complete of these is García-Segura et al. (1996), based on a model for the evolution of a $35 M_{\odot}$ star. A summary of the stages in their scenario is as follows.

During its main-sequence (MS) lifetime the star sweeps the surrounding interstellar material into a thin shell with a radius of tens of parsecs. The interior of the MS bubble is filled with hot ($> 10^6$ K) post-shock stellar wind material. In the absence of thermal evaporation of material at the outer edge, the electron density within the MS bubble should be of order 10^{-3} cm^{-3} .

After 4.5×10^6 years the star evolves off the main sequence and into a red supergiant (RSG). Over its lifetime of 2×10^5 years, the RSG wind fills the inner few parsecs of the MS bubble with cold dense material. The characteristic mass loss rate of the RSG phase is $\sim 10^{-4} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ with terminal velocity 15 km s^{-1} . Between the free-streaming RSG wind and the MS bubble a thin dense shell of post-shock RSG material forms.

Lastly the star enters its Wolf-Rayet phase, with mass loss rate $\sim 10^{-4.5} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, with $V_{\infty} \sim 2000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ over its lifetime of 2×10^5 years. The WR wind progressively sweeps up the RSG material, eventually overtaking the outer RSG shell. The resulting collision fractures the outer shell and the WR bubble breaks out into the MS bubble material. At this point the nebular shell reaches maximum brightness due to its high density; according to their model, the nebula should be detectable over a period of order 10^4 years.

The morphology and dynamics of WR shells are important not only as laboratories for studying wind interactions with the ISM, but also for the insights they provide into the mass-loss history of massive stars as well as the environments into which remnants of core collapse supernovae will propagate and interact. In this paper, we use observations of a region of NGC 6888 obtained with the *Hubble Space Telescope* WFPC2 to study the ionization structure and infer physical conditions within the shell.

2. Observations and Results

2.1. Observations

Observations of NGC 6888 were made in July 1995 using the Wide Field/Planetary Camera 2 on the *Hubble Space Telescope*. The orientation of the field of view is shown on a ground-based image of the nebula in Figure 1. The characteristics of the WFPC2 instrument are described in Trauger et al. (1994). Three of the cameras have an image scale of $0''.0996$ per pixel; the fourth camera has an image scale of $0''.0455$ per pixel. Two exposures were made in each of three filters: F502N ([O III] $\lambda 5007$), F656N ($H\alpha$), and F673N ([S II] $\lambda\lambda 6717, 6731$). The integration time for each filter was 2×1100 seconds. Each pair of exposures was reduced and combined using a cosmic-ray rejection routine. Remaining cosmetic defects were removed by direct inspection of the images. The resultant CCD frames were mosaicked using a routine utilizing the astrometric solution in Holtzmann et al. (1995a). Figure 2 shows a false-color composite of the narrow-band images in a linear stretch, with [O III] shown as blue, $H\alpha$ as green, and [S II] as red. Grayscale images from the individual filters are shown in Figures 3 ($H\alpha$), 4 ([O III]), and 5 ([S II]).

The conversion from DN to surface brightness (in $\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{ sec}^{-1} \text{ pixel}^{-1}$) for the narrow-band filters using the procedure outlined in Holtzmann et al. (1995b);

$$F_{\lambda} = DN \times \left(\frac{14}{GR_i} \right) \times \frac{E_{\lambda}}{A \times QT_{\lambda} \times t_{exp}} \quad (1)$$

where DN = total data numbers in a given pixel, $GR_i \simeq 2$ for the gain state used ($7e^-/\text{DN}$), E_{λ} = energy of a photon at the observed wavelength, A = collecting area of the HST, QT_{λ} = the telescope+filter efficiency at the observed wavelength, and t_{exp} = the exposure time of the image.

The flux must then be corrected for internal and interstellar extinction. Mitra (1990) estimates the extinction in the NW region from the $H\beta/H\alpha$ ratio in the spectra. Results for the three positions are $C_{H\beta} = 0.94, 1.05, \text{ and } 1.13$. Using the median value with the reddening law given by Cardelli et al. (1989), the dereddened surface brightness in this region is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
I(F656N) &= F(F656N) \times 10^{C_{H\alpha}} \\
&= 5.27 F(F656N). \quad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$I(F673N) = 5.04 F(F673N), \quad (3a)$$

$$I(F502N) = 10.2 F(F502N). \quad (3b)$$

2.2. Results

At a distance of 1450 pc one WF pixel corresponds to 2.18×10^{15} cm. The entire field of view is thus about 1 pc on a side. The network of clumps comprising the nebular shell are photoionized by the central star HD 192163, about 3 parsecs away in the direction indicated in Figure 2. We assume that the nebula is oblate; i.e., the clumps and central star lie approximately in the plane of the sky; hence, distances in the image do not suffer geometric foreshortening. Even accepting the prolate shape of Lozhinskaya (1970), distances would only be compressed by 15%. The photoionized clumps are visible to varying degrees in all three filters, with a strong correlation between [S II] brightness and $H\alpha$ brightness. The filaments are typically shorter along the axis pointed towards the central star relative to the axis perpendicular to it. The network of filaments is enveloped by a “skin” of [O III] emission, formed by the shock driven into the external material by some combination of the nebular shell expansion and the pressure of the post-shock WR wind. The diffuse component of the nebular $H\alpha$ and [S II] emission, mostly internal to this skin, is a combination of emission from these two regions. In the NW quadrant, one clump deviates significantly from the positions of the rest of the shell. It has an [O III] arc extending beyond it, as well as a diffuse $H\alpha$ tongue of emission emanating from the clump and extending beyond the arc itself.

3. Photoionization Of The Nebular Shell

The material lost by the central star in its previous red supergiant wind has been swept up by the subsequent fast wind of the current WR phase.

As the shell thinned it became subject to instability and fragmented. The bright patches of visible emission of NGC 6888 seen here are understood to be the fragmented circumstellar shell photoionized by the UV flux of the central star.

3.1. Spatial Profiles

Features were chosen on the basis of high $H\alpha$ brightness. Those clumps with significant variation at the resolution limit were rejected. Those clumps that appeared to have a complicated geometry were also rejected. A total of six clumps across the observed region were chosen from the remaining sample. Spatial profiles were extracted along the direction towards the central star with a stepsize of 0.5 pixel. The positions of the spatial profiles are shown in Figure 6. The background level for each profile was fit by a linear or quadratic function and subtracted. Finally, the depth along the line of sight was estimated from the geometry of a given clump, using the geometric mean of the major and minor axes for the spheroidal clumps and the overall curvature of the extended clumps as a rough equivalent to the emitting column. The volume emissivity of the gas is then given by

$$4\pi j_\lambda = \frac{4\pi I_\lambda}{\Omega l}, \quad (4)$$

where Ω = solid angle subtended by one WF pixel, and l = estimated line-of-sight depth, in cm.

A first estimate of the hydrogen density can be derived from these emissivities; using Osterbrock (1989), Table 4.2, one sees that for 10^4 K gas,

$$4\pi j_\lambda = 3.56 \times 10^{-25} n_p n_e \text{ erg cm}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1} \quad (5)$$

For the clumps chosen the surface brightness and estimated line-of-sight depths result in densities of order 1000 cm^{-3} .

The spatial profiles extracted from the images were modeled using the photoionization code CLOUDY (Ferland et al. 1998). Satisfactory fits were obtained by modeling clumps as thin slabs of constant density with two-component linear wings to the front and rear of the slab. The inflection point of the wings occurs where the density falls to one-half the density of the slab. Thus, each

clump model has five spatial parameters: the beginning and end of the slab, the two inflection points, and the total width of the clump model. The abundances in the gas were fixed at solar values with the exception of helium, oxygen, nitrogen, and sulfur. Helium was fixed at twice the solar abundance, following the results of Kwitter (1981). Varying this abundance did not significantly change the emissivity of the other elements. The other abundances were constrained by the observed profiles. For oxygen and sulfur, the elemental abundance was varied to maximize agreement with the appropriate observed profile. For nitrogen, the abundance was chosen to match the $[\text{N II}]/\text{H}\alpha$ emission ratio to the value observed by Parker (1978) for the corresponding area of the nebula. It is necessary to include the nitrogen emission in the model profile, as the F656N filter admits approximately the equivalent of 15% of the $[\text{N II}]\lambda 6584$ line flux (Biretta et al. 1996), which for NGC 6888 can represent 20% of the counts in the F656N image.

Each clump was placed at its projected distance from the central star. The input ionizing spectrum was the model atmosphere for a WN5/WN6 star presented in Hillier and Miller (1998). For comparison to the observed profiles the model profiles were convolved with a gaussian of width corresponding to the PSF in the images, approximately 0.5 pixel.

3.2. Model Results

A representative comparison of an observed and model profile is shown in Figure 7. Models with terminating ionization fronts consistently overestimated the separation of the peak $[\text{S II}]$ and $\text{H}\alpha$ emissivities, suggesting that the shell does not contain large amounts of neutral material. This is supported by the absence of $[\text{O I}]$ in the spectrophotometry of Mitra (1990); based on observed line fluxes, $I([\text{O I}]\lambda 6300) < 0.02 I(\text{H}\beta)$. The best fit photoionization models required a minimum H-ionizing flux of $\log Q_0 = 49.2$, with significant deviations for two of the models (clumps 2 and 5) for values less than 49.3. This is in reasonable agreement with the value of 49.0 from the Wolf-Rayet models of Crowther and Smith (1996). It is, however, at odds with Marston and Meaburn (1988), who calculate the Lyman continuum flux required to maintain the observed $\text{H}\alpha$ brightness as $\log Q_0$

$= 47.6$. The implications of this discrepancy are addressed in §4.

Models were constructed for $\log Q_0$ from 49.2 to 49.4. The uncertainty on the abundance for an individual model is small; variation in the model elemental abundances by as little as 0.02 dex was sufficient to shift the emissivity of the corresponding line out of agreement with the observation. Using the traditional nomenclature the abundances are $(12 + \log(\text{N}/\text{H})) = 8.1 \pm 0.2$, $(12 + \log(\text{O}/\text{H})) = 7.8 \pm 0.2$, and $(12 + \log(\text{S}/\text{H})) = 6.8 \pm 0.2$. The quoted uncertainty represents the spread between the abundances of all of the models, summarized in Table 1 and shown graphically in Figure 8.

One of the primary sources of error in determining abundances with this methodology is the uncertainty in the estimated line-of-sight depth for a given clump. This somewhat counterintuitive result arises from the fact that, while the ionic abundance can be inferred directly from the observations independent of density or line-of-sight depth, the ionic fraction differs significantly with changes in the density and ionizing flux (i.e., changes in the ionization parameter). For example, a 25% error in the estimated line-of-sight depth is roughly equivalent, in its effect on abundances, to an error of about ± 0.05 dex in Q_0 . This typically corresponds to an uncertainty of about ± 0.1 dex in abundances. In addition, the offset between the peak $[\text{O III}]$ and $\text{H}\alpha$ emissivities were consistently underestimated by the models, which we ascribe to the simplicity of the one-dimensional profile model. This deviation suggests that our oxygen abundance may be systematically low; based on the model electron density at the position of the observed peak, this effect is at most 0.15 dex.

3.3. Comparison with Ground-Based Spectroscopy

A longstanding question in nebular analysis involves the degree to which spectroscopy integrates over structure within nebulae, and the effect of inhomogeneity on inferences based on those data (e.g., the t^2 parameter in Peimbert 1967). Indeed, our images show significant density and ionization structure on spatial scales of $1''$ and shorter. A single resolution element typical of ground based spectroscopy would necessarily sample a range of physically diverse regions. Further, discrete features are typically embedded within diffuse line-

of-sight background that is comparably bright to the features themselves. It is unreasonable to imagine that ensemble-average conditions measured spectroscopically have much physical meaning for specific locations within the nebula. Nor, conversely, can regions sampled spectroscopically be described meaningfully using a single set of physical parameters such as temperature or density.

An examination of inferred electron densities makes the point. Spectroscopy (Kwitter 1981; Mitra 1990) of this region typically yields [O II] and [S II] electron densities in the range from 100 to 450 cm^{-3} , well below our densities of 1000-1600 cm^{-3} . As discussed above, our density estimates are based on no more than the physics of hydrogen recombination. Enforcing spectroscopically-determined densities on features herein would require that their line-of-sight depths exceed their projected sizes by one to two orders of magnitude. A simpler explanation is that ground-based spectroscopy samples not only discrete features, but also unavoidably includes large volumes of lower density, more diffuse material. Roughly speaking, a mix of equal amounts of [S II] emission from gas at 1500 cm^{-3} (typical of our inferred densities) and [S II] emission from gas in the low density limit will yield a “measured” spectroscopic density of around 500 cm^{-3} – *even though there is little or no gas with that density actually present within the sampled volume*. Comparable density inhomogeneities also exist within discrete features themselves. Similarly, our models show that T_e can easily vary by 1000 K within the region sampled by a spectrograph aperture, even in the absence of background emission.

To employ traditional methods of interpreting spectra (e.g., i_{CF} s) it is necessary to assume a certain degree of homogeneity within a zone responsible for emission from a given ion, as well as some correspondence between zones responsible for emission from different ions. These *ad hoc* methods have a definite advantage – they yield an answer. However, the physical assumptions upon which they are based are not well supported by our data or our models. While we do not observe the wealth of lines present in a spectrum, we are able to use a few lines from both low and high ionization species to constrain realistic models of the ionization structure of observed features. Our re-

sulting abundance determinations differ from the results of Kwitter (1981) by +0.3 dex, -0.7 dex, and +0.5 dex for N, O, and S, respectively. The concerns that we raise are in addition to those of Alexander and Balick (1997), who found that the i_{CF} methodology may fail even in cases where the density is homogeneous. While the method we employ embodies its own suite of uncertainties, we suggest that there is ample evidence to warrant increased skepticism regarding the results of traditional nebular abundance determinations.

4. Nature of the Skin Emission

The dense shell is enveloped in a thin skin of emission, best seen at the outer edge of the nebula beyond the network of clumps, and most evident in [O III]. A perpendicular cut taken into the nebula at a bright part of the skin is shown in Figure 9. Notice that there is a rise in [O III] emission, followed by a rise in $H\alpha$ a few 10^{16} cm closer towards the star. If the difference in ionization state across the shell were due to photoionization effects, we would expect that the higher ionization emission would be found interior to the lower ionization emission, as seen in the clump profiles discussed above. Rather, this morphology suggests instead that the leading edge of [O III] emission arises in the cooling behind a radiative shock driven into the relatively low density medium surrounding the shell. The recombination region, however, is “incomplete”, and the postshock flow cools and recombines only to the point that it comes into photoionization equilibrium with the ionizing flux from the star. Since the ionization parameter is high in this trailing photoionized zone, the [O III]/ $H\alpha$ ratio remains high (~ 5) and [S II] remains very weak throughout. There are, however, a few positions where post-shock material is more prominent in $H\alpha$. These are probably locations where the shock is partially “shadowed” from the stellar UV flux by dense clumps within the shell.

An arc seen in the NW quadrant of the field in [O III] emission extends well beyond the general perimeter of the skin. This is morphologically consistent with the early stage of a “blowout”: a place where the shocked stellar wind has broken more completely through the nebular shell material and is expanding outward into the MS bubble itself. An echelle spectrum of this arc was taken in

the light of [O III] in December 1997 by Graham et al. (1998) using the 3.5-m telescope at Mt. Hamilton. We do not discuss this spectrum in detail here other than to note that it showed the characteristic velocity structure of an expanding bubble at this location. Assuming the line-of-sight angle of the expansion is the same as the angle of the arc to the general perimeter of the skin, the echelle arc has in an expansion velocity of $70 \pm 12 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, implying a shock velocity of $\leq 93 \pm 16 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. This is insufficient to produce such a large [O III]/H α in a neutral pre-shock medium, suggesting that the pre-shock medium is fully ionized Cox and Raymond (1985). We show below that this is supported by observation.

We estimate the emissivity of the post-shock gas at the leading edge of the NW arc, again using the geometry to estimate the pathlength. Assuming a temperature of 10^4 K , this yields a hydrogen density of 100 cm^{-3} . Due to Poisson noise, the pathlength estimate, and the unknown temperature, the uncertainty is about a factor of 2. If we assume the pre-shock gas temperature is also 10^4 K , then we can use the isothermal assumption to relate the densities of the pre-shock MS material and post-shock skin material; i.e.,

$$\rho_{skin} = 2M^2 \rho_{MS}. \quad (6)$$

With the shock velocity 93 km s^{-1} , $M = 5.6$, and the resulting pre-shock density is 2 cm^{-3} .

On the basis of our analysis, it is clear that the shell is extremely “leaky” to ionizing emission. Using parameters derived below, the optical depth of the postshock region to ionizing radiation is only about 2×10^{-3} assuming $\log Q_0 = 49.3$, and so any radiation that reaches the shock has effectively escaped from the nebula. The densest knots themselves have optical depths of order 1. As can be seen from the more face-on portions of the shell in 1, such dense knots cover a very small fraction of the surface of the nebula. As a result, Zanstra methods cannot be used to obtain reliable estimates of the total H-ionizing flux of the central stars of objects such as NGC 6888. Based on the H-ionizing flux budget of the nebula obtained by Marston and Meaburn (1988) ($\log Q_0 = 47.6$) and the value derived in this work (49.3), *only 2% of the ionizing photons from HD 192163 are processed within the nebular shell of NGC 6888.*

Another consequence of this analysis is that any material surrounding NGC 6888 will be fully ionized. This implies that there cannot be a significant amount of neutral material close to the observed nebula as suggested by Marston (1995). However, an ionized shell of density 2 cm^{-3} exterior to the nebular shell could contain a significant amount of mass with low surface brightness. It may be that a major portion of the estimated $18 M_\odot$ of material lost in the RSG wind has been lost to the MS bubble, and exists as a low density shell is only visible in post-shock emission.

5. Discussion

NGC 6888 is primarily composed of the material from the RSG wind of the Wolf-Rayet progenitor, swept into a shell by the central star’s WR wind. This shell is photoionized by the UV flux from the central star. We combine the results of this paper and previous X-ray observations to create a coherent picture of the past and present state of NGC 6888. In Figure 10 is a sketch of the optical and X-ray emitting regions.

5.1. Gas Pressure

The gas pressure of a shocked stellar wind can be expressed in terms of its mass loss rate and its terminal velocity. For an adiabatic shock, the post-shock gas pressure is

$$P_w = \frac{3\dot{M}V_\infty}{16\pi R_w^2} = 2.88 \times 10^7 \dot{M}_{-4} V_3 R_w^{-2} \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ K}, \quad (7)$$

where $\dot{M}_{-4}$ is the mass loss rate in units of $10^{-4} M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$, V_3 is the terminal velocity in units of 10^3 km s^{-1} , and R_w is the radius of the termination shock in parsecs.

Crowther and Smith (1996) derive the stellar parameters $\dot{M}_{-4} = 1.23$ and $V_3 = 1.75$ from model fits to infrared observations of WR 136. In addition, they also summarize the results of previous studies for this object. If we assume that the inner edge of the X-ray emission corresponds to the location of the termination shock, we estimate that $R_w = 3.1 \text{ pc}$. These results yield a pressure behind the stellar wind shock of

$$P_w = 3.4 - 5.3 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ K}. \quad (8)$$

assuming that the location of the termination shock is not changing rapidly.

The X-ray flux comes from the post-shock WR wind material. For the X-ray emitting region, the results of Wrigge et al. (1994) were used for the temperature, emission measure, and emitting volume. (We note that we suspect the value quoted in their paper for the emission measure has a transcription error, resulting in an error of a factor of 10^{28} . We use this corrected value in this paper.) The density can be derived from the emission measure E ; i.e.,

$$n_H^2 V \sim E \times 4\pi D^2, \quad (9)$$

where V is the volume of the emitting region, and D is the distance to the nebula. Wrigge et al. (1994) get an emitting volume of $7 - 12 \times 10^{55} \text{ cm}^3$ and a (corrected) emission measure of $(1.5 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-5}$, then at an assumed distance of 1450 pc the density of the X-ray gas is $n_H = 0.3 - 0.8 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. With a temperature of $2.36 \pm 0.52 \times 10^6 \text{ K}$, the pressure of the X-ray gas is

$$P_X = 1.4 - 3.8 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ K}, \quad (10)$$

roughly equal to that of the post-shock stellar wind. This gas is not simply the post-shock wind material, as its expected temperature is $4.2 \times 10^7 \text{ K}$ and of such low density that it would be unable to cool quickly to the observed X-ray gas temperature. Instead, this material is probably the result of thermal evaporation of nebular shell material into the post-shock stellar wind (Hartquist et al. 1986). The rough equivalence between the pressure expected from eq. (8) and the pressure of the observed gas from eq. (10) supports this contention.

The gas pressure of each of the regions can be calculated assuming an ideal gas law. For the outer shock and nebular shell, the values used are those derived in the previous sections. For the outer shock, the pressure is

$$P_{skin} \sim 2 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ K}. \quad (11)$$

Given uncertainties in parameters used to infer pressures for the various components of NGC 6888, this is not significantly different from the pressures inferred for the shocked stellar wind and the X-ray gas.

For the clumps comprising the nebular shell the central pressure can be calculated from the models. Using a peak density of 1300 cm^{-3} at a temperature 10^4 K typical of the spatial profile models yields a pressure of

$$P_{shell} = 26 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ K}. \quad (12)$$

Thus, clumps in the nebular shell are in severe overpressure compared to the surrounding gas, by a factor of order 10. This is consistent with the inclusion of density ramps in the model profiles of these regions, although the magnitude of the discrepancy is surprising. With typical clump size of 10^{17} cm , isothermal expansion of the clumps at the sound speed should alleviate this pressure discrepancy on a timescale of order 2000 years. This implies that until recently the termination shock was at $R_w < 1.3 \text{ pc}$. If we assume that the loss of pressure support for the termination shock would result in its motion outward at the stellar wind velocity, it would take of order 1200 years for R_w to move from 1.2 to 3.1 pc. Considering that the clump pressure was initially higher than now observed coupled with the quadratic dependence of pressure with R_w , there can be a considerable time where the clumps have not yet come into pressure balance with its surroundings.

Is there evidence supporting the contention of rapid depressurization of the bubble interior? Initially, we note that the thickness of the postshock region behind the outer [O III] skin provides an estimate of the age of this shock. Assuming a post-shock density of 100 cm^{-3} , a preshock density of 2 cm^{-3} , a shock velocity of $\sim 100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, and a thickness of 10^{16} cm , the shock broke through the densest portion of the shell about 1500 years ago. Blowouts can also be seen on the global scale of NGC 6888. In Miller and Chu (1993) Figure 3b, one sees that the elliptical nebular shell is enclosed by a complete, approximately spherical [O III] bubble. The loss of containment would cause a rapid drop of internal pressure like that implied by the pressure mismatch between the shell and stellar wind. If we use the time for the clumps to expand into balance with the new pressure as a constraint, then the edge of the blowout has to traverse 1.3 pc in much less than 2000 years, requiring an expansion velocity well over 600 km s^{-1} . This implies that the density in the outer MS bubble

drops with increasing distance. Using the present internal pressure as a lower limit, the density of the outer MS bubble is still $> 0.1 \text{ cm}^{-3}$.

5.2. Comparison with Hydrodynamical Simulations

The most complete numerical simulations of Wolf-Rayet bubble formation and dynamics is García-Segura et al. (1996). In it, they follow the evolutionary phases of a massive star, with main-sequence, red supergiant, and Wolf-Rayet mass loss. In summary, they produce an MS bubble 30 pc in radius, filled with hot (10^7 K) thin (0.002 cm^{-3}) material; $18.5 M_{\odot}$ of RSG material, with a thin shell of post-shock RSG material at the RSG-MS interface; and a Wolf-Rayet wind that sweeps up the RSG material, leading to a collision with the thin RSG shell and eventually breakout of the WR wind into the MS bubble. The results of this paper show two main deviations from this picture. First, as argued before, the material filling the MS bubble is at least 0.1 cm^{-3} . For the MS bubble density implied by García-Segura et al. (1996), any outer shock would not be visible. The thermal pressure of the observed material is the same as that assumed for the simulations, so a thin RSG shell can still form. Second, their post-collision shell density (1000 cm^{-3}) is consistent with that derived in this paper, but the total mass of the shell is 4 times higher than that implied by our result of a fully ionized shell. A simple resolution to both of these differences is the presence of thermal evaporation from the thin RSG shell into the MS bubble. At 2 cm^{-3} , a $\sim 1 \text{ pc}$ thick annulus of material outside the nebular shell would have a mass of $15 M_{\odot}$ of material and still be undetectable in the WFPC2 image. A smaller annulus with a density gradient could hide a similar mass. It has also been suggested that the central star's proper motion can remove it from its relic MS bubble; this does not resolve the RSG mass loss issue. Another minor issue is that of the limitation of these simulations. In a non-spherical shell the pressure will drastically change before the shells collide along the major axis. How that alters the dynamics of the shell is undetermined, although the problem of ellipsoidal shells was pursued in García-Segura and Mac Low (1995).

6. Conclusions

NGC 6888 is a bubble formed by the mass loss of the precursor to the central star WR 136. The internal pressure of the shocked WR stellar wind has swept up the ejecta from the previous RSG phase. This material collides with a thin RSG shell formed at the MS bubble interface, fragmenting into the clumps seen today. Models of spatial profiles of selected clumps appear to be fully ionized, resulting in a $\log Q_0 > 49.2$ for the central star, and average abundances for the shell material of $[\text{N}, \text{O}, \text{S}] = [8.1, 7.8, 6.8]$. The oxygen depletion appears even more severe than that seen in previous spectroscopic studies.

The internal pressure of the stellar wind drives a shock into the material external to the visible shell. The shock is visible in $[\text{O III}]$ and $\text{H}\alpha$ as a skin enveloping the clump network. The density of this material suggests that the MS bubble cooled efficiently. Combined with the mass of the visible shell compared to the total mass loss of the RSG phase, we argue that thermal evaporation of material from the outer RSG shell has already occurred. Comparing the pressure inside and outside the nebular shell suggests that a radical drop in pressure has recently occurred, and that the clumps have not yet come into equilibrium with the current pressure of the stellar wind.

7. Acknowledgments

BDM would like to thank Jason P. Aufdenberg and Ravi Sankrit for helpful comments in the preparation of this paper. The authors would also like to thank Dr. Hillier for providing his WN5/WN6 model atmosphere for the preparation of this paper. This work was supported by NASA grant NAS 5-1661 to the WF/PC Investigation Definition Team (IDT) and NASA contract NAS-7-1260 to the WFPC2 IDT. This work was supported at Arizona State University by NASA/JPL contracts 959289 and 959329 and Caltech contract PC 064528.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, J. and Balick, B. 1997, *AJ*, 114, 713
- Biretta, J. A. et al. 1996, *WFPC2 Instrument Handbook*, Version 4.0 (Baltimore: STScI)

- Cardelli, J. A., Clayton, G. C., and Mathis, J. S. 1989, *ApJ*, 345, 245
- Cox, D. P. and Raymond, J. C. 1985, *ApJ*, 298, 651
- Crowther, P. A. and Smith, L. J. 1996, *A&A*, 305, 541
- Dufour, R. J. 1989, *RMxA&A*, 18, 67
- Esteban, C. and Vílchez, J. M. 1992, *ApJ*, 390, 536
- Ferland, G. J., Korista, K. T., Verner, D. A., Ferguson, J. W., Kingdon, J. B., and Verner, E. M. 1998, *PASP*, 110, 761
- García-Segura, G., Langer, N., and Mac Low, M.-M. 1995, *ApJ*, 455, 160
- García-Segura, G., Langer, N., and Mac Low, M.-M. 1996, *A&A*, 316, 133
- Graham, J., Levenson, N., and Hester, J. J. 1998, private communication
- Hartquist, T. W., Dyson, J. E., Pettini, M., and Smith, L. J. 1986, *MNRAS*, 221, 715
- Henry, R. B. C., Kwitter, K. B., and Howard, J. W. *ApJ*, 458, 215
- Hillier, D. J. and Miller, D. L., *ApJ*, 496, 407
- Holtzmann, J. A., Hester, J. J., Casertano, S., Trauger, J. T., Watson, A. M., and the WFPC IDT 1995a, *PASP*, 107, 156
- Holtzmann, J. A., Burrows, C. J., Casertano, S., Hester, J. J., Trauger, J. T., Watson, A. M., & Worthey, G. 1995b, *PASP*, 107, 1065
- Johnson, H. M. and Hogg, D. E. 1965, *ApJ*, 142, 1033
- Kwitter, K. B. 1981, *ApJ*, 245, 154
- Lozhinskaya, T. A. 1970, *Sov. Astron.*, 14, 98
- Marston, A. P. and Meaburn, J. 1988, *MNRAS*, 235, 391
- Marston, A. P. 1995, *AJ*, 109, 2257
- Miller, G. J. and Chu, Y.-H. 1993, *ApJS*, 85, 137
- Mitra, P. M. 1990, Ph.D. Thesis, Rice University
- Osterbrock, D. E., *Astrophysics of Gaseous Nebulae and Active Galactic Nuclei* (University Science Books, Mill Valley, CA)
- Parker, R. A. R. 1978, *ApJ*, 224, 873
- Peimbert, M. 1967, *ApJ*, 150, 825
- Trauger et al. 1994, *ApJ*, 435, L3
- Van Buren, D. 1986, *ApJ*, 306, 538
- Weaver, R., McCaray, R., Castor, J., Shapiro, P., and Moore, R. 1977, *ApJ*, 218, 377
- Wendker, H. J., Smith, L. F., Israel, F. P., Habing, H. J., & Dickel, H. R. 1975, *A&A*, 42, 173
- Wrigge, M., Wendker, H. J., and Wisotzki, L. 1994, *A&A*, 286, 219

Fig. 1.— Ground-based image of NGC 6888, showing the field observed with WFPC2. North is at the top and east is to the left. The WFPC2 footprint is approximately $150''$ (1 pc at a distance of 1450 pc) on a side.

Fig. 2.— False-color composite of the WFPC2 images of NGC 6888. Emission from [O III] is shown in blue. Emission from $H\alpha$ is shown in green. Emission from [S II] is shown in red.

Fig. 3.— WFPC2 image of NE section of NGC 6888 taken through the F656N filter, which isolates light from $H\alpha$ $\lambda 6563$. North and east are indicated by the arrows. The bar has a length of $10''$, corresponding to 2.2×10^{17} cm. The negative display uses a square-root stretch to allow comparison over a large range in surface brightness.

Fig. 4.— WFPC2 image of NE section of NGC 6888 taken through the F502N filter, which isolates light from [O III] $\lambda 5007$. The negative display uses a square-root stretch.

Fig. 5.— WFPC2 image of NE section of NGC 6888 taken through the F673N filter, which isolates light from [S II] $\lambda\lambda 6717, 6731$. The negative display uses a square-root stretch.

Fig. 6.— Positions and widths of spatial profiles extracted from the WFPC2 data, superimposed on the $H\alpha$ image.

Fig. 7.— a. Volume emissivities from spatial profile 3. The distance into the clump is measured from the point towards the star at which the $H\alpha$ profile flattened out. $H\alpha$ is plotted with a solid line; S II, dotted line; O III, dashed line. b. Photoionization model for $\log Q_0 = 49.3$ that best matched the observed profile. c. The data (solid) with the model (dotted) overplotted. Distance increases away from the central star.

Fig. 8.— Plot of model nitrogen, oxygen, and sulfur abundances as a function of the total H-ionizing flux $\log Q_0$. The lines are identified by their correspondent spatial profile number.

Fig. 9.— Spatial profile of the outer shock of NGC 6888. The $H\alpha$ surface brightness has been increased by a factor of 5 to ease comparison; [S II] has been raised by a factor of 10. Distance increases toward the central star.

Fig. 10.— a. Sketch of the wind-blown bubble as the red supergiant (RSG) wind is being swept up by the Wolf-Rayet (WR) wind into a “WR shell”. The “MS bubble” is composed of a mixture of relic main-sequence wind material and evaporated “RSG shell” material. b. The bubble some time after the WR and RSG shells collide. The post-shock WR wind now streams past the fragmented RSG shell and directly interacts with the MS bubble, driving a shock visible as a “skin” enveloping the nebular shell. The MS bubble material is shadowed from the UV flux of the central star by the densest of the knots in the nebular shell, affecting its [O III] flux.

TABLE 1
MODEL PARAMETERS FOR SPATIAL PROFILE FITS

Spatial Profile		log Q_0				
		49.20	49.25	49.30	49.35	49.40
1	Peak $n_H(\text{cm}^{-3})$	1570	1570	1540	1530	1520
	N	8.02	8.02	8.06	8.11	8.18
	O	7.77	7.71	7.67	7.63	7.59
	S	6.45	6.52	6.60	6.68	6.71
2	Peak $n_H(\text{cm}^{-3})$	1300	1310	1320	1320	1320
	N	8.03	8.04	8.05	8.09	8.16
	O	7.68	7.57	7.57	7.52	7.47
	S	6.69	6.79	6.81	6.87	6.91
3	Peak $n_H(\text{cm}^{-3})$	1030	1020	1010	1000	1000
	N	8.11	8.18	8.26	8.34	8.43
	O	7.54	7.48	7.47	7.41	7.40
	S	6.72	6.82	6.90	6.92	6.98
4	Peak $n_H(\text{cm}^{-3})$	1150	1140	1140	1140	1130
	N	7.69	7.72	7.77	7.85	7.95
	O	8.05	7.98	7.89	7.86	7.82
	S	6.68	6.77	6.83	6.89	6.96
5	Peak $n_H(\text{cm}^{-3})$	1100	1100	1100	1130	1120
	N	8.13	8.15	8.16	8.19	8.26
	O	7.77	7.77	7.72	7.72	7.67
	S	6.53	6.56	6.61	6.66	6.76
6	Peak $n_H(\text{cm}^{-3})$	1500	1500	1490	1490	1480
	N	7.96	7.98	8.03	8.10	8.19
	O	7.87	7.77	7.72	7.65	7.61
	S	6.89	6.94	7.00	7.04	7.08

This figure "fig1.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003053v1>

This figure "fig2.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003053v1>

This figure "fig3.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003053v1>

This figure "fig4.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003053v1>

This figure "fig5.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003053v1>

This figure "fig6.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003053v1>

This figure "fig7.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003053v1>

This figure "fig8.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003053v1>

This figure "fig9.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003053v1>

This figure "fig10.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0003053v1>